

Appl. No. 10/559,641
Reply to Office Action mailed May 27, 2008

R E M A R K S

Claims 1 to 4, 9 to 18, 20 and 22 to 24 were rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, for the reasons set forth in item nos. 3 to 5 on pages 2 to 3 of the Office Action.

1. Claims 1 and 18 (Item No. 4 on
Pages 2 to 3 of the Office Action)

a. The position was taken in the Office Action that claims 1 and 18 are indefinite for not reciting ranges of amounts for ingredients (a) or the resin solid content of ingredient (a). Applicants respectfully disagree with such position for the following reasons.

The amounts of solid matter of ingredient (b) and ingredient (c) are clearly specified in claims 1 and 18 with reference to 100 parts by mass of the resin solid matter of ingredient (a) (hereinafter referred to as "requisite I"). Further, the coating thickness of the dried coating obtained from treating agents is clearly specified (hereinafter referred to as "requisite II").

For an organic coating or an inorganic coating, a component ratio per se of a dried coating to be obtained is a very

Appl. No. 10/559,641
Reply to Office Action mailed May 27, 2008

important factor, and the ratio is determined by the above-mentioned requisite I, wherein the amount of the solid matter is defined.

The thickness of the surface coating, particularly in a case of using a painting-type surface treating agent, is determined mainly by adjusting the concentration (dilution ratio) of the solid matter in the surface treating agent. Therefore, to obtain a desired coating thickness suitable for application, a concentrated solution of treating agent is used after properly diluting the solution by 2, 10 and 100 times or so. Hence, although the amount of each component in the surface treating agent largely varies, depending on the degree of dilution, the ratio of each component per se is not a feature which fluctuates. After all, the ratio of solid matter in each component of a treating agent is the very feature which is important.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that it would be easy for a person having ordinary skill in the art to arrive at the amounts of ingredient (a) and the resin solid content of ingredient (a) once the ratio of solid matter of each component (requisite I), and the thickness of the dried coating (requisite II) are known.

Appl. No. 10/559,641
Reply to Office Action mailed May 27, 2008

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
AUG 27 2008

b. The position was taken in the Office Action that with respect to claim 1, the recitation of the ingredients following the phrase "on the surface coating" is awkward, since what follows is a description of the coating ingredients, not the coating.

Claim 1 was amended hereinabove to reply to this ground of rejection.

c. With respect to the sentence bridging pages 2 and 3 of the Office Action regarding claims 1 and 18, the term "structured by" has been deleted from claims 1, 16 and 18.

2. Claims 22 to 24 (Item No. 5
on Page 3 of the Office Action)

Claims 22 to 24 were amended to avoid this ground of rejection.

The amendments to claims 22 and 23 are supported on page 31, line 13 to page 32, line 4 of the specification.

The amendment to claim 24 is supported on page 78, line 11 to page 79, line 27 of the specification.

Withdrawal of the 35 USC 112, second paragraph rejection is respectfully requested.

Appl. No. 10/559,641
Reply to Office Action mailed May 27, 2008

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

AUG 27 2008

Reconsideration is requested. Allowance is solicited.

If the Examiner has any comments, questions, objections or recommendations, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the telephone number given below for prompt action.

Respectfully submitted,

Frishauf, Holtz, Goodman
& Chick, P.C.
220 Fifth Avenue, 16th Fl.
New York, NY 10001-7708
Tel. No. (212) 319-4900
Fax No.: (212) 319-5101
E-Mail Address: BARTH@FHGC-LAW.COM
RSB/ddf



Richard S. Barth
Reg. No. 28,180